legislation would require that certain DBS services that provide video programming reserve between 4 and 7 percent of the channel capacity of their service for noncommercial public service uses. This will provide another important means of distribution of noncommercial public service programming and CPB urges the Commission to take whatever steps are necessary to reserve sufficient capacity for the effective distribution of such programming.

E. ALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS DELIVERY TECHNOLOGIES SHOULD SERVE THE PUBLIC INTEREST BY ENSURING THAT NONCOMMERCIAL PUBLIC SERVICE COMMUNICATIONS ARE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC ON ALL SUCH SYSTEMS

In sum, CPB urges the Commission to ensure that the spectrum allocated for new telecommunications delivery technologies is managed and used by operators in a manner and for purposes that best serve the public good. CPB further believes that the regulatory scheme for future telecommunications services likewise must include a public service requirement even where radio frequency spectrum is not required to operate such systems. Success in this regard will be governed generally by the regulatory scheme that is adopted — particularly the manner in which service providers are allowed access to the systems, and the uses that are granted or denied priority.

Accordingly, in developing its policies and rules for new telecommunications technologies, the Commission should seek to uphold a basic goal of today's public broadcasting services: universal access to public telecommunications services. In this effort, the Commission should consider not only basic access or carriage issues, but should also consider reasonable, affordable access to ensure that financial or technological resources do not limit access for different socio-economic classes.

In furtherance of this goal, CPB requests that the Commission maintain its current regulatory commitment to public telecommunications through the continued application of preferences, spectrum reservations, dedicated capacity, or whatever other system of special considerations or exclusive treatment is appropriate for the use of particular technologies in delivering noncommercial public service communications. This is especially critical with the advent of various compression technologies which can greatly increase the channel capacity of certain delivery systems. There is ample precedent for such recognition of the unique circumstances and special needs of noncommercial public services. It can be found in the history of statutory, regulatory and industry negotiated requirements which have been imposed on communications delivery technologies and systems for the purpose of increasing the access of noncommercial public services to those communications and delivery technologies.

Finally, the FCC should seek to ensure that sufficient resources are made available for research, development, and operation of new public telecommunications services through government tax-based revenues. Government funding was essential to the development of today's public broadcasting system. But significant additional resources will be necessary to develop services that can offer substantial public benefit by using the rapidly advancing telecommunications technologies.

IV. CONCLUSION: THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD MAINTAIN ITS COMMITMENT TO PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS THROUGH APPROPRIATE REGULATORY AND LEGISLATIVE POLICIES

One thing is certain about the future multichannel video marketplace: the competition among alternative media will continue to increase significantly. As the competition continues to intensify commercial media, including both cable and broadcast, will need to focus on maximizing revenues from advertisers and subscribers. Thus, it will be less likely that they will be interested in, or able to afford to, focus on public service programming, and even less likely that they will make it their highest priority. Furthermore, no matter how great its successful, there will be limits on cable's reach. As Newton Minow explained more recently in revisiting his "vast wasteland" speech of 1961, "'[a]lthough some viewers have gone from a vast emptiness to a vast fullness, others have been excluded. Choice through cable comes at a price not all can afford' and others aren't able to receive cable." Newton Minow speech on October 2, 1991, at National Press Club commemorating the 30th anniversary of WETA-TV in Washington, D.C., as reported in Communications Daily on October 3, 1991 (Mr. Minow is a former Chairman of the FCC and of PBS, as well).

On the positive side, as the multichannel marketplace expands so does variety of mechanisms for delivering programming to the American public. Accordingly, the future multichannel marketplace and the rise of cable do not challenge the existence of public television, but rather challenge its ability to take risks and invest in public service programming which can be shown on commercial cable or through

other multichannel distributors. Thus, public television's statutory mission will not be thwarted; it will be maximized by the many new opportunities to serve the American public.

There is, however, a caveat to this optimistic view. Public television's can only pursue this important role in the multichannel marketplace if the federal Government continues its strong commitment to public telecommunications. CPB therefore urges the Commission to maintain its regulatory commitment to public telecommunications through the continued application of preferences, spectrum reservations, dedicated capacity, or whatever other system of special considerations or exclusive treatment is appropriate for the particular technology or circumstances. In addition, we urge the Congress to recognize that the reasons for federal support of public telecommunications will be stronger than ever in the future multichannel environment.

Respectfully,

Paul E. Symczák // Senior Vice President,

General Counsel and Secretary

OF COUNSEL:

EDWARD COLTMAN, Director ANDREW RUSSELL, Deputy Director Policy Development and Planning

Senior Staff Attorney

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING Washington, D.C. 20004-2006 (202) 879-9600

NOVEMBER 21, 1991